

**REMARKS**

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 24, 2002, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by October 24, 2002.

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 6-9 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being in improper form as a multiple dependent claims depending from another multiple dependent claim. Accordingly, claims 6-9 were not treated further on the merits. Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,726,520 to Grahn, WO 98 18169A ("WO '169"), or EP 0 112 454 A ("EP '454").

Turning first to the objection to claims 6-9, the Applicant filed a Simultaneous Amendment on September 5, 2002, at the time this application was filed. In that amendment, claims 1-9 were all amended to eliminate any multiple claim dependencies. It appears that perhaps the Examiner did not receive this Simultaneous Amendment, and therefore, the Applicant includes herewith a copy of the Simultaneous Amendment of September 5, 2002.

For purposes of this amendment, then, the Applicant has amended the claims as they stood following this Simultaneous Amendment (i.e., having no multiple claim dependencies). The Applicant also assumes that the Examiner will not consider claims 7-9 on their merits, based on the existence of this Simultaneous Amendment.

Looking now at the substantive rejection of claims 1 -5 under Section 102, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that any of the cited references anticipates the present invention as defined in the pending claims. However, in order to more clearly define the present invention over these references, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to add the features of claims 2 and 6, which have been canceled. Specifically, amended claim 1 now defines that the rotor 11 is supported in the rotor receptacle 16 in a fashion that allows it to be rotated with friction, and that the friction between the rotor 11 and the rotor receptacle 16 is such that the rotor 11 does not follow relatively rapid revolutions of the rotor receptacle, but follow relatively slow revolutions of the rotor receptacle.

In contrast with the subject matter of the cited patents, the rotor of the present invention is driven by friction, using inertia effects. In the cited documents, however, the friction between the rotor and receptacle is not changed. WO '169 and EP '434 show actuators with clamp units that are alternately clamped to the rotor and released. This causes the rotary movement of the rotor. However, this movement is very slow.

According to the present invention, however, the friction between the rotor and receptacle is always constant and is such that the rotor does not follow fast movements of the receptacle. Rather, the rotor follows the slow movements of the receptacle. This is a totally different driving principle than the driving principles of the cited references.


Therefore, claim 1, as amended, cannot be viewed as anticipated by any of the cited references, when each of these references fails to disclose an essential feature of the claimed invention.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 and dependent claims 3-5 and 7-9 are all patentable over these references. The Applicant further requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

In light of the foregoing arguments in support of patentability, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700